

Family matters: Jacopo Sansovino's *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier* in San Salvador, Venice

VICTORIA AVERY AND EMMA JONES¹

After his election as Doge of Venice in June 1554, Francesco Venier (1489-1556) changed his modest sepulchral plans to something more in keeping with his new position as head of state. Instead of a simple burial of “little pomp” in the far-flung church of San Francesco della Vigna, Venier secured a prominent, well-located site within the prestigious and centrally-located church of San Salvador, stipulating that no less than 1,000 ducats be spent on his funerary monument. The posthumous sepulchral commission – overseen by Venier's beloved brother Piero – resulted in the enormous gilded, polychrome marble and stone monument still *in situ* today (fig. 1), adorned with sculptures by two of Venice's greatest cinquecento sculptors, Jacopo Sansovino (ca. 1486-1570), and his erstwhile assistant, Alessandro Vittoria (ca. 1524/25-1608).² This article reconsiders the monument's commissioning history, through a re-examination of published archival documents and printed primary sources, followed by an analysis of previously unpublished litigation records. These fascinating new documents not only reveal the legal proceedings that Francesco Sansovino (1521-1586) set in motion in March 1571, four months after his father's death, but also clarify, for the first time, the extent of Jacopo Sansovino's involvement in the project and confirm the iconography of the two niche statues.

Who was Francesco Venier? Born on 29 May 1489, Francesco was the eldest son of nobleman Giovanni Venier, a descendant of Doge Antonio (sixty-first doge; r. 1382-1400), and Maria Loredan, daughter of Doge Leonardo (seventy-fourth doge; r. 1501-1521).³ According to early biographers, a soothsayer in Spain

foretold his election to the dogeship, a prediction in which the young Francesco firmly believed despite his weak constitution, and a destiny reinforced during his late forties when, as ambassador to Rome, he was dubbed “The Little Doge” by Pope Paul III. A wealthy but modest-living and highly devout bachelor, Francesco resided in a rented property in central Venice with his brother Piero, his eventual chief executor and primary beneficiary. Francesco was a gifted orator, astute diplomat and able administrator with great tenacity. On 11 June 1554, just after his sixty-fifth birthday, he was elected eightieth doge of Venice.⁴

Upon his election, Venier commissioned his official portrait from Titian, to join those of his predecessors in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio of the Doge's Palace. Although this illustrious series was destroyed by the catastrophic fire in 1577, a second version exists (fig. 2), presumably commissioned for another official location, or for a private setting.⁵ This effective piece of visual propaganda shows Venier in his new dignity, resplendent in his dogal regalia, emanating the authority, majesty, and power invested in the role: a far remove from the sickly, gaunt, and hunched man who would soon require the help of two supporters to walk. During his short reign, which lasted just shy of two years,⁶ Venier continued his punctilious and diligent administration and, apart from a general famine, his dogeship was peaceful and uneventful. In keeping with his new status, he appears to have adopted a more conspicuous lifestyle: in his funeral oration, Bernardino Loredan recalled “the very lavish pomp of his feasts and banquets with ornate sideboards, the preciousness of his dress and other such magnificent things”.⁷

Fig. 1 / Jacopo Sansovino and Alessandro Vittoria, *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier*, ca. 1556-1561, coloured marble and Istrian stone, with partial gilding, Venice, San Salvador.

Like many other doges before and after him, Venier felt it important to leave his mark and glorify his career and family, as the story of his funerary monument makes clear. From his will of 18 July 1550, written at the age of sixty-one, we know that Venier originally envisaged a humble burial.⁸ Herein, he stated: “I want to be buried in San Francesco della Vigna with little pomp and as my executors see fit”, with the express wish that 15 ducats be left to the friars in addition to the funeral costs.⁹ The childless Venier nominated five executors, all relatives, but specified that his primary executor was to be Piero, “my very much loved and truly cordial brother”.¹⁰ He stipulated that 300 masses be celebrated at the time of his death wheresoever his executors wanted, and ordered that 20 ducats be left to the Scuola Grande della Misericordia (of which he was a member) for distribution to impoverished brethren, and a further 15 ducats for the poor of the parish in which he died.¹¹ The fact that Venier made no mention of a monument, nor allocated money to construct one, suggests that he wanted only to be buried in the ground, possibly without even a simple grave-marker.¹² This humility and simplicity is further reflected in his choice of final resting place: with the Observant Franciscans in one of their most remote outposts in Venice, the church of San Francesco della Vigna (fig. 3). Located, according to legend, on the spot where an angel of the Lord had appeared to Venice's patron saint, Saint Mark the Evangelist, and pronounced the immortal blessing, “Pax tibi Marce, Evangelista meus”, the ancient church was then in the process of being rebuilt to a design by Jacopo Sansovino.¹³

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Venier changed his mind considerably after his election as doge, when personal preferences and private wishes were forced to give way to both family honour and public expectation associated with the dogal office. On 1 April 1555, less than ten months into his reign, he obtained a concession and mansionary agreement with the Augustinian Canons of San Salvador, drawn up by notary Marco Antonio Cavanis.¹⁴ This stated that Venier was “desirous of securing a location in the aforementioned Monastery of San Salvador in order to make or have made an honourable sepulchre in

which to bury his corpse, or his bones, as well as those of his heirs”.¹⁵ The concession agreement specified the site allocated to him: the fourth bay of the right-hand aisle of the nave, between the altars and pilasters of the chapels of Saint Mary and Saint Augustine, lying directly opposite the organ and doorway leading out onto the Mercerie.¹⁶ The agreement further stated that the doge was permitted to erect “an honourable sepulchre decorated in whatever way he most desired”, which could be built both into the wall and into the floor.¹⁷ As was common with such concessions, a mansionary was included whereby the monastery was to elect one of its brothers to celebrate a daily mass in perpetuity for the doge's soul.¹⁸ In return, Venier promised to transfer to San Salvador a 400-ducat investment in the Monte Nuovissimo, one of Venice's state loan schemes.¹⁹

Five months later, on 25 September 1555, Venier updated his will by means of a codicil, in which he revised his instructions regarding his posthumous commemoration.²⁰ Having revoked his earlier wishes regarding burial in San Francesco,²¹ he ordered “that in so far as the ceremonies are concerned, they should follow those customarily given to our predecessors by their heirs in addition to that which for the public is normally done”.²² Venier expressed his wish to be buried in San Salvador in the space that had recently been conceded to him by the Augustinian Canons, and instructed that “we wish that at least 1,000 ducats, and not more than 1,500 ducats be spent on the making of our sepulchre and its adornment in the wall-façade and in the floor,” which indicates that work on the monument had not yet begun.²³ Although his codicil suggests that Venier intended to get the project underway during his lifetime, he added the oft-used proviso that a family member – in this case his brother Piero (or failing him, one of Piero's sons) – should oversee the monument's completion within two years if it had not been built by the time of his death.²⁴ Finally, he ordered quite explicitly that his body was to be buried in the tomb in the floor, and not in the chest affixed on the wall, a desire motivated by humility and in shameful recognition of his wretchedness before God.²⁵



Fig. 2 / Titian, *Portrait of Doge Francesco Venier*, ca. 1554-1556, oil on canvas, 113 x 99 cm, Madrid, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza.



Fig. 3 / Jacopo de' Barbari, *Bird's-eye View of Venice*, 1500, woodcut, 137.7 x 277.5 cm, Minneapolis Institute of Art. Marked up with location of key churches.

It is tempting to think that some of Venier's decision-making was influenced by the ongoing saga of the monument to his maternal grandfather, Doge Leonardo Loredan.²⁶ Certainly, the large sum of money that Francesco Venier specified be spent on his monument was comparable. In August 1532, Lorenzo Loredan (Leonardo's eldest son) had stipulated that 1,300 ducats be allocated to his late father's funerary monument in Santi Giovanni e Paolo;²⁷ while in January 1536, following Lorenzo's death, his nephew Leonardo di Girolamo Loredan successfully petitioned the Dominican friars for permission to spend 1,500 ducats erecting it.²⁸ The Loredan Monument was at this point in time to take the form of a large and ornate freestanding bronze sarcophagus crowned with an effigy of the doge, positioned in the middle of the sanctuary in front of a new marble high altar with three statues in bronze or marble, surmounted by a marble pyramid with a crystal ciborium. For reasons unknown, but perhaps linked to a hike in the price of bronze (from 50 ducats to over 80 ducats per *mier*) caused by the ongoing wars with the Ottoman Turks, the project ground to another halt.²⁹ By the time that Venier wrote his codicil in September 1555, some thirty-four years after Doge Leonardo Loredan's death, absolutely no progress had been made on his grandfather's monument, who was still buried in an

unmarked floor-tomb before the high altar in Santi Giovanni e Paolo. It may have been this embarrassing lack of progress that prompted Venier to stipulate the two-year completion deadline for his own monument.

As Bruce Boucher observed, Francesco Venier acknowledged in his codicil the need to respect the traditional expectation for a doge to have a suitable burial place and monument,³⁰ and it may be that he considered a number of alternatives before settling on San Salvador. Santi Giovanni e Paolo would have been the obvious choice given that this was the unofficial pantheon of the doges and was where his funeral was to take place (see fig. 3).³¹ It was also where his ancestor Doge Antonio Venier was commemorated in a notable monument erected in the early fifteenth century (figs. 4 & 5) and where his grandfather's monument was projected.³² Perhaps Venier decided to avoid the Dominican motherhouse so as not to be overshadowed by either. Another location that he may have considered was the Franciscan motherhouse on the opposite side of town, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari (see fig. 3). This was another enormous basilica in which several dogal monuments had been erected, including those to Francesco Foscari (sixty-fifth doge; r. 1423-1457) and Nicolò Tron (sixty-eighth doge; r. 1471-1473; fig. 6).



Fig. 4 / Unknown Venetian workshop, *Monument to Doge Antonio Venier*, ca. 1403-1411, Istrian stone, Carrara marble, coloured marble, Venice, Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

Fig. 5 / Detail of fig. 4, with five of the *Virtues* including *Charity* in the centre.



In the end, Venier opted for San Salvador, no doubt well aware of the message this particular choice would send, and the honour and prestige it would confer on both him and his family. Unlike San Francesco della Vigna, it was centrally situated and highly visible, occupying a prime location in the Rialto, the city's economic centre, and close to Piazza San Marco, its civic and spiritual heart (see fig. 3). It also trumped San Francesco della Vigna in terms of historical importance. Reputedly one of the first seven churches to be founded in Venice by divine order, it held the relics of Saint Theodore (Venice's original Byzantine patron saint), which had been transferred from the ducal church of San Marco in 1267. Following the church's reconstruction (begun in 1506, during the reign of his grandfather Doge Leonardo Loredan), San Salvador's new Greek cross design deliberately echoed that of San Marco, as Francesco Sansovino remarked in his famous 1581 guidebook to Venice.³³ Moreover, the new foundation stone had been laid in 1507 quite deliberately on 25 March – the Feast of the Annunciation and the day on which in 421 Venice had reputedly been founded by divine order – in order to link San Salvador inextricably to the birth of Venice. This was reinforced by its location in the Rialto, the nucleus of Venice or (to quote Doge Leonardo Loredan, in a letter of April 1515 about the church's reconstruction) the “navel of the city” or the “city's lap”. As Daniela Bohde explained, “Venice was conceived of as a virgin body with the church of the Saviour in the middle.”³⁴ Furthermore, the enormous (approximately 9 by 12.5 m) memorial space that Venier had managed to negotiate for himself within this key church was highly desirable and prominent. Close to both sanctuary and sacristy, it was also directly opposite the organ-loft and Mercerie portal meaning that the Venier Monument would be the first thing anyone would see when entering the church from the busy Mercerie thoroughfare, which directed (as it still does today) a great deal of foot traffic from San Marco to the Rialto. What better place for the pious yet status-conscious Doge Francesco Venier to be buried, thereby reinforcing his family's ties with this august institution?



Fig. 6 / Antonio Rizzo, *Monument to Doge Nicolò Tron*, 1476, coloured marble and Istrian stone, with partial gilding, Venice, Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari.



Fig. 7 / Tullio and Sante Lombardo, *Monument to Doge Giovanni Mocenigo*, completed 1522, Carrara marble, verde antico and portasanta, Venice, Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

Fig. 8 / Detail of fig. 7, with lunette, effigy, sarcophagus and inscription.

In many ways, as Bruce Boucher and others have pointed out, the Venier Monument as built is highly conservative and backward-looking, conforming to the by-now standard formula of dogal tombs established in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries (see fig. 1). As the oft-cited comparison with Tullio and Sante Lombardo's *Monument to Doge Giovanni Mocenigo* (finished in 1522; figs. 7, 8 & 9) in Santi Giovanni e Paolo makes clear, its basic design was typical: a recumbent effigy beneath a lunette relief incorporating figures of the doge, his name-saint and the Virgin and Christ, framed by female personifications of virtues and a lengthy epitaph, with one or more family coats-of-arms crowned with the *cornio* (dogal hat) in the attic storey, set within a classicizing triumphal arch divided into three bays.³⁵





Fig. 9 / Detail of fig. 7, left-hand Virtue.

Fig. 10 / Alessandro Vittoria and workshop, *Pietà* with Saint Francis and Doge Francesco Venier, 1557-1558, Istrian stone, with partial gilding, from *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier*, Venice, San Salvador.

Another previously acknowledged and pertinent source, given the family ties, was the above-mentioned *Monument to Doge Antonio Venier* in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, which was one of the first dogal monuments to incorporate the features that were soon to become standard (see figs. 4 & 5).³⁶ As Boucher remarked: “Francesco Venier must have wished for something similar, cast in a more contemporary style, to sustain the honour of the Venier *casata*, and Sansovino fulfilled his brief by creating what could be called the last of the High Renaissance ducal tombs.”³⁷

Despite its conservatism, the Venier Monument does have a number of features that distinguish it from previous dogal tombs. First, the iconography of the lunette is unusual, if not to say unique, in having a *Pietà* in the centre (fig. 10). While images of the youthful Virgin and infant Christ enthroned were to be found all over Venice, and were popular in dogal monuments (see fig. 8), images of the elderly Virgin with the dead adult Christ in her lap were rare.³⁸ It is possible that Francesco Venier chose this particular Marian iconography to underline the associations of the church's location in the “city's lap”. Whatever the reasons for its choice, this novel subject permitted a change in dynamic between those portrayed. Rather than the patron saint – in this case Francis of Assisi – performing the role of intermediary, standing in close physical proximity to the deceased, and actively introducing him to the Virgin and Child, here the saint joins the doge as devotee. Both saint and doge are shown in identical active adoration, kneeling humbly and reverently before the dead Christ and his mourning mother, whom they flank as dual protectors. That the doge is permitted into the sacred presence in his own right, implies a particular holiness that sets him apart from his predecessors, all of whom required an intercessor. However, proper decorum and correct relational hierarchies are maintained by placing Saint Francis on the proper right of Christ and the Virgin, traditionally the position of greatest honour, while the doge is placed on the proper left. Moreover, the heads of both the Virgin and Christ are directed



emphatically towards the saint, who is allowed to lean in to touch reverently Christ's lifeless wrist. While the Virgin acknowledges the presence of the doge, her gesture is one that gently bids him to keep a respectful distance. Despite the height at which the lunette is placed, it is easy to read because it contains only four figures with the central pair composed as a single entity, and there is sufficient space between them to avoid too much overlapping, which could impair legibility.

Second, there are far fewer statues and reliefs on the Venier Monument than on most earlier dogal tombs (see, for example, fig. 6). Rather than an army of figures of varying sizes,³⁹ the Venier Monument has just three

large and imposing figures: the recumbent effigy of the doge atop a sarcophagus (figs. 11 & 12), flanked by female personifications of two Theological Virtues set in niches (figs. 13 & 14). Moreover, there is just one large lunette relief, and no subsidiary narratives. This drastically-reduced number enhances the figures' prominence and legibility, allowing the personifications to be carved on a scale much larger than life.⁴⁰ In terms of which two Theological Virtues are represented, the left-hand woman protecting two toddlers is instantly recognizable as Charity, specifically in the guise of *caritas proximi* (love for one's neighbours) rather than as *caritas Dei* (love for God), who would have been shown with a cornucopia or flaming heart (fig. 13).



Although *caritas proximi* was “a virtue appropriate to the prince of the Venetian state” (to quote Boucher), personifications of Charity with children were rare, the notable earlier exception being the central virtue on the sarcophagus of his forebear Doge Antonio Venier (see fig. 5).⁴¹ *Charity*’s companion, meanwhile, is without attributes, shown simply as a woman looking tenderly and patiently upwards, arms clasped across her breast, which has led to debate as to whether she represents Faith or Hope (figs. 14 & 15). Given that Faith is nearly always shown holding a chalice, cross, or book, most scholars have argued that she personifies Hope, who does appear on occasion without any attributes.⁴²

The minimizing of the sculptural elements gives greater prominence to the architectural framework, and also more space for the conspicuous plinth with its lengthy epitaph, carved in comparatively large (and therefore legible) letters, in which Venier is commemorated as a wise and virtuous leader (see fig. 12).⁴³ The size of the plinth also has the benefit of raising the sarcophagus and effigy over the heads of the niche statues, to the very heart of the monument, so the doge becomes the centre

of a great triangle composed of the *Pietà* at its apex and the *Virtues* at its base (see fig. 1).⁴⁴ Furthermore, the limited amount of sculpture has the effect of simplifying the overall iconographic programme, making it much easier to comprehend: the central section clearly commemorates Venier as doge with the inscription extolling him as an exemplum of civic virtue; the rest honours him as an exemplum of sacred piety. Given that Charity and Hope are included, it seems logical to view the *Pietà* not only as a visual metaphor of intercession as has been suggested,⁴⁵ but also as an allegory of Faith, thereby ensuring that all three Theological Virtues are present, with Faith accorded particular prominence at the very top and in the form of an allegorical relief.

The lack of statuary is more than compensated for in the architectural features, especially in the enormous and magisterial double-heightened columns crowned by Composite capitals and the abundance of variegated and polychromed marbles and stones, which render it surely one of the most brightly coloured dogal monuments that had been built to date as well as one of the most expensive (see figs. 1, 12-14).⁴⁶

Fig. 11 / Alessandro Vittoria and workshop, effigy of Doge Francesco Venier (detail), 1558, Istrian stone, with partial gilding, from *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier*, Venice, San Salvador.



Fig. 12 / Detail of fig. 1, with effigy, sarcophagus and inscription.



Fig. 13 / Jacopo Sansovino, *Charity*, ca. 1556-1561, Istrian stone, 239.4 cm high, from *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier*, Venice, San Salvador.



Fig. 14 / Jacopo Sansovino, *Hope*, ca. 1556-1561, Istrian stone, 241 cm high, from *Monument to Doge Francesco Venier*, Venice, San Salvador.

The lavishness of the marbles is echoed in the abundance of gilding, which is used to pick out details within the lunette, as well as on the robes, cushions and sarcophagus of the doge, the coats-of-arms and many architectural elements, including the capitals, bases, and mouldings, and the background of the inscription (see figs. 1, 10-14).⁴⁷ A further novel architectural feature is the bench that runs along the entire width of the monument's base (see fig. 1), which recalls those originally placed in front of the Loggetta.⁴⁸ Public seating in Renaissance Venice was a rarity, making the provision of a generous seating area significant and deliberate. While it would clearly have increased the project's overall cost, the bench offered visitors a simple, yet tangible example of the doge's *caritas proximi*, and would thus have served to reinforce the monument's iconographic message in a practical way. It was also savvy, as it would have encouraged pilgrims and visitors to the church to sit and linger and, whilst doing so, hopefully also offer up prayers for the soul of the departed doge.

In terms of chronology, the evidence discussed above suggests that work on the monument did not begin until after Francesco Venier's death in June 1556. In his 1581 guidebook to Venice, Francesco Sansovino noted that the doge "had been buried in the church of San Salvador, in a most sumptuous and regal marble sepulchre, erected to his memory by his brother Pietro".⁴⁹ That the monument was erected posthumously and overseen by Piero Venier, in accordance with Francesco Venier's testamentary instructions, is confirmed by various incoming and outgoing payments in Alessandro Vittoria's account-book for work on both the *Pietà* and the figure of the recumbent doge.⁵⁰ Significantly, the first outgoing payment connected with this commission, dated 30 October 1557, described the lunette as "the *Pietà* of the Most Noble Venier, brother of the Prince", in other words, Piero Venier.⁵¹ The first incoming payment for the *Pietà*, meanwhile, dated 6 November 1557, was specified as coming "from the Magnificent Mr Giovanni [sic] Venerio", namely Giovanni Venier, son of Piero, and nephew of the late doge.⁵² Indeed, every subsequent incoming payment for both the

Pietà and the dogal effigy was disbursed by Giovanni, suggesting that he played an active role in assisting his father with the administration of his uncle's estate.⁵³ These payments are of further importance because they provide the only firm dates for when the Venier Monument was made, and demonstrate that Piero was keen to fulfil his late brother's wishes and ensure that the monument was erected swiftly. Whether the monument was actually completed within two years of Francesco's death (i.e. by 2 June 1558) is uncertain, but Vittoria's contributions were certainly ready by then. A *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the complex is provided by a document of 8 November 1561 concerning work to the floor between the Venier Monument and the organ loft opposite, in which the doge's finished tomb is mentioned.⁵⁴

As for authorship of the Venier Monument, until recently there were no known archival documents, so scholars have had to rely on published primary sources and visual analysis. Jacopo Sansovino was first named as responsible for the monument by Giorgio Vasari; not, however, in his earliest biography of Sansovino in the 1568 edition of *The Lives of the Artists* (in which the monument goes unremarked), but in his expanded biography of the master, published after the latter's death in 1570. Herein, Vasari gave the monument to Sansovino, in passing:

And in Venice, he [Sansovino] gave splendour to the Piazza through the façade of San Geminiano, and in the Merceria the façade of San Giuliano, and in San Salvador the most sumptuous sepulchre of the Prince Francesco Venier.⁵⁵

It is possible that this information – as well as other details about Sansovino's life and work missing from the 1568 edition of *The Lives* – was supplied to Vasari by Francesco Sansovino, Jacopo's only son and lifelong champion.⁵⁶ Indeed, in his guidebook to Venice published in 1581, Francesco appears to have been at pains to confirm and indeed clarify his late father's role in the monument, stating:

... and nearby is to be found in a sepulchre of marble, alongside two figures of singular beauty, by the hand of Sansovino, that is both the architecture of the tomb as well as the aforementioned figures, [the body of] Francesco Venier, 80th Doge, [whose election] was in the year 1554.⁵⁷

This emphatic attribution, in which Jacopo Sansovino is explicitly named as both the architect and the sculptor of the niche figures – and not once, but twice – is interesting because its formulation is remarkably similar to the passing reference made by Vasari to the Venier Monument in his 1568 edition of *The Lives*, but which occurs in the biography of Jacopo Sansovino's most talented pupil, Alessandro Vittoria. Herein, Vasari appears to attribute not only the *Pietà* to Vittoria, but also the two *Virtues*:

... and nearby he [Vittoria] made a Pietà, alongside two figures of stone that are regarded as good, which are in San Salvador in Venice.⁵⁸

The mirroring of Vasari's syntax by Francesco Sansovino in his 1581 text, combined with his careful explication of Jacopo's role, should surely be seen as a concerted attempt by Sansovino junior to put the published record straight. In fact, Jacopo Sansovino's dual role within the Venier Monument is underscored by the unusual and elaborate form of his signature, which appears in identical form, spread over two lines, on the square socle of each niche figure: "IACOBVS SANSOVINVS SCVLPTOR / ET ARCHITECTVS FLORENTINVS .F." ("Jacopo Sansovino sculptor and architect from Florence made [this]") (fig. 16).⁵⁹

Despite his advanced age and never having designed a dogal funerary monument, there were many compelling reasons why Jacopo Sansovino was awarded this prestigious commission, not least the fact that, by the

mid-1550s, he was the most important architect and sculptor in Venice and was in huge demand.⁶⁰ Not only had his architectural projects in Piazza San Marco (the Library, Mint, and Loggetta) transformed Venice's chief square beyond recognition but, during Venier's reign, he had been awarded the commission for a new building at the Rialto, the *Fabbriche Nuove*, which was in the process of giving Venice's trading centre a much-needed facelift. Sansovino was also well known to Venier in his role as architect of the Scuola Grande della Misericordia (of which confraternity Venier was a member), and as project lead on two key artistic commissions in the Doge's Palace, both of which came during Venier's reign: the colossal statues of *Mars* and *Neptune* for the top of the external ceremonial staircase in the courtyard (commissioned on 31 July 1554), and the Scala d'Oro. It is possible that Procurator Antonio Cappello influenced the decision (if any were needed): not only was he a confidant of Venier (having been one of his electors in 1554), but he had also long been a champion and consistent supporter of Sansovino.⁶¹

The construction of the Venier Monument's architectural framework would have been contracted out to a trusted stonemason by Piero Venier directly, or by Sansovino on his behalf. While it remains undocumented as to which "tagliapietra" undertook this work, Salvador *quondam* Vettor, Sansovino's friend and collaborator, is a strong possibility.⁶²

In terms of the sculptural aspects of the monument, the comments by Giorgio Vasari and Francesco Sansovino together with the payments recorded in the account-book of Alessandro Vittoria discussed above, have permitted scholars to assign the *Virtues* to Jacopo Sansovino and the lunette relief of the *Pietà* and the *gisant* figure of the doge to Alessandro Vittoria. It is not clear why the latter elements were passed to Vittoria, but perhaps Sansovino was too busy to take these on as well, and so decided to give his former pupil, whom he had loved like a son, a "leg up" by recommending

him for the job – as he had recently done with the colossal pair of female caryatids, known as the *Feminoni*, commissioned to flank the main entrance to the Library.

Vittoria's respective role in the *Pietà* and effigy can be established by analysis of the related payments in his account-book. Work on the *Pietà* began around mid-October 1557 and continued until early March 1558, with the final incoming payment disbursed to Vittoria on 8 March 1558 (see fig. 10).⁶³ In total, Vittoria received 70 ducats for the lunette;⁶⁴ while he paid out just 9 *lire* 6 *soldi* to Antonio di Maestro Picio for seven days' work,⁶⁵ and 4 *lire* 16 *soldi* to Tommaso da Zara for an unrecorded number of days' work "for having cleaned the Virgin of the Pietà as the final payment in our agreement".⁶⁶ Vittoria's accounts show that work on the effigy only began once the *Pietà* had been finished: work on this started in late March 1558 and must have been satisfactorily completed by 30 May, when Vittoria received the final payment from Giovanni Venier (see figs. 11 & 12).⁶⁷ Vittoria was paid a total of 45 ducats for the effigy, and disbursed a total of 5 ducats, 2 *lire* and 3 *soldi* to Antonio di Maestro Picio for 25½ days of work.⁶⁸

Vittoria's direct payment by the Venier estate suggests that he was contracted separately by Piero Venier for both sculptures, rather than subcontracted by Sansovino, through whom he would otherwise presumably have been paid.⁶⁹ This would make sense given that, on 25 July 1557, Vittoria had been accepted as a master by the city's stonemasons' guild.⁷⁰ While Vittoria's account-books show whom he employed, when, for how long and sometimes for which task, they do not reveal how much time he himself devoted to a commission. Although the extent of Vittoria's personal input therefore remains undocumented, there is a direct correlation between the quality of the finished work and his active participation in it. An ambitious, busy sculptor like Vittoria had to choose wisely how best to manage his time, meaning that the number of hours he

personally spent on any one commission depended on how he ranked its importance in relation to others being executed simultaneously (in terms of patron, setting, and artistic challenge), and to a lesser extent on how much he was being paid for it, and impending deadlines.⁷¹

An analysis of the payments made to Antonio di Maestro Picio for work on both the *Pietà* and the dogal effigy demonstrates that Vittoria considered the lunette to be more important, probably because of its greater visibility and the creative scope it offered. The payments to his assistant indicate that it was carved first, in late 1557, with only seven days' help from Antonio. This included five days of unspecified work in late October, perhaps for blocking out given its timing at the start of the commission, and two days in early December for "having worked on the Doge of the Pietà".⁷² In contrast, the effigy (which conformed to the standard recumbent type, with cadaver slightly inclined so as to render the facial features more visible from below) was carved afterwards, and presumably mostly by Antonio, given that he dedicated 25½ days to it between 26 March and 23 April 1558 – which presumably accounts for its rather mechanical carving.⁷³ By delegating work on the *gisant* figure, Vittoria freed himself to begin a new commission, the over life-size figure of *Fame* to crown the *Monument to Admiral Alessandro Contarini* in the Santo, Padua, for which he had been promised 60 ducats.⁷⁴ Although not more prestigious than the dogal effigy, *Fame* was certainly more challenging from an artistic point of view, and more prominent being the crowning element of the Contarini Monument. This is presumably why Vittoria devoted his energies to the *Fame* rather than splitting his time more equitably between it and the dogal effigy. This uneven division of labour is underscored by the fact that Vittoria re-employed Antonio for only five days on the *Fame*, paying him for unspecified work on 18 March 1558.⁷⁵ He then set Antonio to work on the effigy of Doge Venier, freeing himself up to work on the *Fame* from late March until late December 1558.⁷⁶

After Vittoria's final payment from Giovanni Venier on 30 May 1558,⁷⁷ the archival record falls silent for some thirteen years until 27 March 1571, when Francesco Sansovino, son and heir of the recently deceased Jacopo, and Piero Venier, the late doge's brother, began arbitration.⁷⁸ The hitherto unpublished documents for these legal proceedings offer a new example of Francesco's concerted efforts to extract money from Jacopo's patrons – part of his wider posthumous campaign to protect and promote his late father's memory and reputation as a great artist.⁷⁹ Interestingly, just four days earlier, on 23 March 1571, he had made similar complaints against the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra for additional compensation for his father's work on the bronze Sacristy Door in the ducal church of San Marco, a project that had been actively worked on during Doge Francesco Venier's reign but which was not to be installed until early 1569.⁸⁰

In the case of the Venier Monument, the documents reveal that Francesco Sansovino appears to have initiated a formal disagreement with Piero Venier over payment for both the architectural aspects and the sculptural work that Jacopo had undertaken. Opting for arbitration suggests that at least one complaint (from Francesco) and one rebuttal (from Piero) had already been exchanged without resolution.⁸¹ Arbitration could be sought out of court or via the appropriate magistracy in Venice, and it basically involved independent experts investigating a case, and pronouncing judgement on it, which would legally settle it once and for all. In the case of disputes over works of art and architecture, arbiters might be called upon to assess whether a completed commission was good enough, determine what work remained to be done, or assess the final value of the end result. Normally, arbitration involved the appointment of two expert arbiters, one chosen by each party to represent their interests, with the appointment formally recorded in a notarial act called a “compromesso” (Italian) or “compromissum” (Latin).⁸² In the litigation over the Sacristy Door, for example, a document of 23 October

1571 records how the procurators originally chose Paduan sculptor Francesco Segala (1535-1592) to represent their interests, while Francesco Sansovino nominated Tuscan-born Veneto-based sculptor Danese Cattaneo (ca. 1512-1572).⁸³

In the present case, the arbiters were nominated on 27 March 1571, and were recorded as being Danese Cattaneo and Alessandro Vittoria. Although neither was named as the specific nominee of either Sansovino or Venier, it is more likely that Sansovino junior would have favoured Cattaneo, who had been a good friend of his late father, and had recently acted as one of his executors.⁸⁴ Indeed, as just mentioned, less than seven months later, Francesco Sansovino was to nominate Cattaneo as his assessor in the Sacristy Door litigation. And equally, Vittoria would have been the more natural choice for Piero Venier, given that the younger sculptor had actually worked on the commission and had signed an independent agreement with him for the *Pietà* and the dogal effigy. As no objections about either arbiter appear to have been raised, presumably both appointments were mutually agreed, no doubt because both Cattaneo and Vittoria had real expertise in the art of sculpture and a shared first-hand knowledge of Jacopo's workshop and working practices.

The arbitration document further reveals that the two sculptors were given until the end of the following month to adjudicate the dispute: namely, to determine whether or not Jacopo Sansovino had been adequately rewarded for his work on the Venier Monument as both sculptor and *proto*.⁸⁵ As was standard, it was agreed that should Vittoria and Cattaneo be unable to agree, then a third arbiter could be appointed to enable a majority decision to be reached.⁸⁶ It appears that this is exactly what happened because eight days later, on 4 April, Giovanni Venier, on behalf of his father, nominated the sculptor Tommaso Contin as a third arbiter.⁸⁷ Two days after this, on 6 April, Francesco Sansovino approved Contin's appointment; and the three arbiters were granted the remainder of the month to reach

a decision. Resolving the issue, however, evidently continued to be problematic as, on 30 April (the stipulated deadline), the trio was granted a two-week extension.⁸⁸

Finally, on 14 May 1571, the joint decision was delivered by Vittoria and Contin in the absence of Cattaneo.⁸⁹ After a Latin summary outlining the issue and naming those involved, their adjudication is given in Italian.⁹⁰ This deals first with Francesco's claim about the architectural aspects of the commission, finding in favour of Piero Venier and confirming that Jacopo Sansovino had indeed been adequately remunerated for all the work that this had entailed, namely “the drawings, templates, models, and instructions as befits such a work”.⁹¹ It then moved onto the sculptural aspects stating that with regard to the “two principal figures of Rovigno stone, that is a Charity and a Hope, placed in the two large niches of the sepulchre, over which there was difficulty”,⁹² the arbiters accepted Piero Venier's sworn statement that he had made an agreement with the late Sansovino for the statues and that this had been fulfilled on both sides, with the latter having received an additional payment either as a courtesy or at the specific request of the sculptor.⁹³ The arbiters further ruled that while Piero Venier was not obliged to disburse any further payments to Francesco Sansovino, neither was Francesco Sansovino obliged to repay the additional payment, which he could keep “because the work truly merits it”.⁹⁴ The document ends with the standard statement that the matter was now settled, and that the arbiters were to be paid two *scudi* each by Piero Venier for their adjudication.⁹⁵ Later that day, a third document records how the judgement had been read aloud to Francesco Sansovino, who agreed to it and who swore an affidavit before the notary that he would abide by the arbiters' decision.⁹⁶ The documents end with a final statement on the matter, made the following day by Piero Venier.⁹⁷ Although short, this affidavit is important because it records how Piero Venier had commissioned the niche figures of *Charity* and *Hope* from Jacopo Sansovino for

80 ducats each, with the express stipulation that the sculptor had to place his name under each one “to guarantee that he [the patron] would be well served”, and how he had given the sculptor a bonus payment of 20 ducats, above and beyond the agreed price.⁹⁸

These litigation documents are significant because they confirm a number of key facts about the Venier Monument over which there had previously been some uncertainty, namely: first, it was Piero Venier (and *not* Doge Francesco) who contracted Jacopo Sansovino as architect-cum-*proto*; second, that in this capacity Sansovino not only designed the complex but also provided the requisite drawings, architectural templates and models for use by the stonemasons; third, that the two niche figures were commissioned as a pair direct from Jacopo Sansovino by Piero Venier; fourth, that the right-hand sculpture was intended to be read as a personification of *Hope* (and not *Faith*); fifth, the agreed price paid for each figure was 80 ducats; sixth, Sansovino's signature was a contractual stipulation; and seventh, to guarantee quality a bonus payment of 20 ducats was agreed at the start and disbursed at the end, proving that the patron must have been fully satisfied with how both statues turned out. The practice of awarding a bonus for work well done was not uncommon, serving as an incentive for the timely and satisfactory completion of a commission. The bonus could be an amount (unspecified in the contract) that was evaluated on completion by third-party experts, known as “periti”, or it could be a fixed sum (or gift-in-kind) detailed in the original contract.⁹⁹ It remains undocumented as to when and how the bonus payment to Sansovino was determined and delivered.¹⁰⁰

From these facts, other deductions can be made. Given that Piero Venier commissioned the architecture as well as the two niche statues from Sansovino, it follows that the commission was posthumous (as Doge Francesco had only asked his brother to take over the project were it not started by the time he died). This means that it cannot have started before 2 June 1556, and progress

must have been steady to warrant Vittoria being commissioned to carve the *Pietà* in mid-October 1557, if one assumes that work on this element would not have begun until the inner arch's dimensions were absolutely secure, as it needed to fit so precisely. It remains unknown when Sansovino was contracted to carve the *Virtues*, nor how long he was given to finish the work, but given his generous bonus payment, it is fair to assume that these were made within the necessary time-frames. Given that Vittoria had completed his sculptures by the end of May 1558, and that these may have been the final elements contracted, delivered, and installed, it is possible that the Venier Monument was finished by June or July 1558 – and thus pretty much within the two-year time-frame demanded by Doge Francesco in his will. Whatever the case, as stated above, the monument was definitely complete by 1561, a remarkable achievement and one which would have put the heirs of Doge Leonardo Loredan to shame with their continuing lack of progress on his monument in Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

The documents also provide helpful data about prices, and confirm that there was a going rate for figure sculpture irrespective of who made it: given that the average (labour-only) price for a life-size standing figure in Istrian stone was ca. 60 ducats in the mid- to late sixteenth century, the 80-ducat price-tag for each *Virtue* seems fair, given their much larger dimensions.¹⁰¹ Although not explicitly stated, the fact that the arbitration was all about proper compensation for Jacopo Sansovino's artistic input, the basic fee of 80 ducats per figure almost certainly excluded the cost of the Istrian stone.¹⁰² It would follow that this was also true for the sculpture commissioned from Alessandro Vittoria: so, the 70 ducats for the lunette, and the 45 ducats for the *Pietà* were payment for Vittoria's time and artistic input, and did not include any costs for the materials.

What of Sansovino's signature and Piero Venier's insistence on it (fig. 16)? While this contractual stipulation does not appear frequently in the surviving records for sculpture in cinquecento Venice, it is not unknown. On

3 June 1536, for example, when the *Massari* (overseers) of the Arca del Santo in Padua contracted Jacopo Sansovino to carve the relief of *The Miracle of the Maiden Carilla*, they clearly held him in high regard, calling him “Messer Jacopo Sansoin [*sic*], Florentine, most excellent sculptor, resident in Venice”, and stipulated that he was “obliged to place his carved name under the said relief”.¹⁰³ As Sarah Blake McHam observed, this requirement was proof of the *Massari*'s high esteem for him.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, Piero's insistence of a signature suggests a similar appreciation of Jacopo Sansovino, and an intention to highlight the role of Venice's leading architect and sculptor in the memorial that was to honour both his late brother and the Venier family name. But, the one reason stated in the arbitration document was “to guarantee that he [the patron] would be well served”.

The practice of signing sculpture in sixteenth-century Venice, which increased as the century progressed, belies the high levels of delegation and collaboration behind the finished work.¹⁰⁵ As Piero Venier would have known, the art of carving was, by necessity, a team effort, especially for sculptors who ran busy and successful workshops, such as Sansovino and Vittoria. In many cases, the master's direct intervention would be limited to making the small-scale preparatory model(s), normally in clay or wax. He would leave his assistants to convert this into a full-scale plaster model, and then translate this into carved form, from the initial blocking out (sometimes undertaken by professional “squadrotori”) all the way through to carving the near final surface. The master would rarely intervene himself, but would keep a watchful eye on progress. As Sansovino candidly explained to the Duke of Ferrara in a letter of September 1550, this “hands-off” approach was standard practice in his own workshop:

I agreed [to making a statue of Hercules], with the intention of having it made by one of my assistants, guiding him and correcting him, without touching it myself, as I am used to doing here with many other

sculptures, since the buildings of which I am in charge prevent me from having the time to sculpt with my own hand.¹⁰⁶

It was usually only when a sculpture was in its final stages of completion that the master would step in to finish and perfect the carving of the most important elements, such as face and hands, which required particularly sensitive treatment to imbue them with credible expression and emotion. Once the carving was completed, assistants would then be asked to carry out the final tasks of cleaning and polishing – again with the master's non-tactile guidance.

Although the statues of *Hope* and *Charity* are both “signed” by Sansovino, they differ considerably in quality. *Hope* (figs. 14-16) is by far the more beautiful and compelling of the two, which suggests that Sansovino personally intervened more in her production than in that of her pendant, which lacks emotional depth and whose face appears in comparison like an expressionless mask, or that the majority of carving was assigned to a more talented assistant.¹⁰⁷ So what does Sansovino's signature on the two statues signify? As observed by Wolfgang Wolters, the wholesale signing of sculpture only really took off after Sansovino's arrival in Venice in 1527,¹⁰⁸ and was undoubtedly tied up with the changing status of sculptors over the course of the century, from manual artisan to intellectual artist, considered on an equal footing with painters and architects.¹⁰⁹ In terms of authorship and the collaborative nature of sculpture, the physical signing emphasizes the important concepts of invention, intellect, and *ingegno* that lay behind a work's design.¹¹⁰ Thus, Sansovino's signatures on *Hope* and *Charity*, advertising the fact that he was both a sculptor and architect, extend the stamp of his authorship to the design of the whole of the Venier Monument, and (to paraphrase Francesco, his proud son and greatest champion) clearly mark this magnificent marble sepulchre with its “figures of singular beauty” as a work “by the hand of Sansovino”.¹¹¹



Fig. 15 / Detail of head and upper body of *Hope*.

DOCUMENTARY APPENDIX

Transcriptions by Emma Jones

The original spelling has been retained, excepting the letters ‘j’ and ‘u’, where ‘i’ or ‘v’ respectively were intended. Abbreviated Italian words have been expanded where helpful to the reader, and a modicum of modern punctuation and capitalisation of names and places has been inserted to aid comprehension.

[ill.] illegible word or gap in the document
[?] suggested transcription of a word

Doc. 1

1571, 27 March

Appointment of arbiters in the litigation between Francesco Sansovino and Piero Venier, brother of the late doge. Sculptors Alessandro Vittoria and Danese Cattaneo are appointed first. On 4 April 1571, a third arbiter, Tommaso Contin, is appointed.

Compromissum [in margin]
Die dicta ad cancellum
Quia vertitur quaedam difficultas inter Cl.m D. Petrum Venerio q. Cl.mi D. Ioannis exuna [fol. 168r] et ex.tem Il. D. D. Franciscum Sansovinum filium, et heredem q. Sp. D. Iacobi ex altera exquo dictus D. Franciscus pretendit satisfactionem causa sculpturae, et protariae ob sepulturam B. M. Serenissimi Principis D. Francisci Venerio in ecclesia S. Salvatoris, Venetae et ex adverso idem Clarissimus Dominus Petrus intendit integraliter satisfacisse dictum D. Iacobum Il.mi est pro supra hmoi. differentia Magnificus D. Ioannes Venerio filius predicti Clarissimi D. Petri agens paterno nomine quem promisit ratificatarum ex una et sup.tus ex.tus D. Franciscus nomine quo super ex altera sese compromiserunt de iure et de facto more veneto, et inappellabiliter in D. Alexandrum Victorium Sculptorem et D. Danesium Cathaneum Sculptorem absentes tamquem presentes in suos iudices arbitros arbitratores communes amicos et amicaibles compositores ad arbitrandum terminandum modificarum componerum absoluerum, et condemnarum uni parti accipiendum et alteri dandum et de iure et de facto more veneto, et inappellabiliter sententiandum qualiter die et hora ferriata et non ferriata presentibus partibus [fol. 168v] et absentibus citatis, et non citatis iuris ordine servato, et pretermisso cum libertate ipsis D. Iudicibus concessa in casu discordiae eligendi tertium promittentes ipse partes se firmum ratum et inappellabile habituras quicquid pro partes D. Iudices arbitros vel maiorem partem eorem si tertius fuerit electus de eo super promissis terminatum iudicatum et sententiatum fuerit sub obligatione, omnium suorum bonorum duraturo presenti compromisso pro totum mensem aprilis proxime venturum cum libertate iudicibus concessa prorogandi semel et pluries. Testes D. Hieronymus Zulberti q. D. Vincentii et D. Dominicus de Saliis q. ex.tis D. Hieronimi Phisici 1571 die martis vigesimoseptimo martii [fol. 168r; in margin:]
1571 die mercurii 28 martii ad cancellum

Contrascriptus Clarissimus D. Petrus Venerio audito tenore contrascripti compromissi per me not. sibi lecti illud laudavit et ratificavit promittens habere firmum et ratum quicquid sententiatum fuerit pro dictos D. Iudicus etc
Mag.s D. Nicolaus Contareno q. Clarissimi D. Sebastiani eq. D. Andreas de Rubeis mercarius ad signum Clavium 1571 die mercurii 4 mensis aprilis ad cancellum
Contrascriptus Magnificus Dominus Io. Venerio paterno nomine in tertium coniudicem elegit D. Thomá dal Contino Sculptorem
Testes D. Bernardinus de Nasis et S. Baptista Tonsor supra platea q. S. Io. 1571 die veneris .6. aprilis ad cancellum
Contrascriptus D. Franciscus Sansovino ratificat et elegit ut supra
Testes D. Dominicus de Saliis q. ex.tis D. Hieronimi Phisici / D. Iacobus Chiedo q. Io. Michaelis [fol. 168v; in margin:]
1571 die lunae 30 aprilis ad cancellum
Contrascriptae partes proprogant compromisum pro dies quindecim proxime futuros
Reverendus D. F. Hieronimus Boldu ordinis cruciferorum D. Io. Savina qd. Francisci civis et notarius venetus Archivio di Stato di Venezia (hereafter ASVe): Notarile-Atti, busta 5614, fols 167v-168v. First transcribed in Jones, “Business,” III, no. 4, doc. 4.8 (unpublished PhD thesis). Unpublished.

Doc. 2

1571, 14 May 1571

The final arbitration decision by Vittoria, Cattaneo and Contin.

Arbitraria [in margin]
In Christi nomine Amen. Nos Alexander Victoria et Thomas de Continis electus á partibus in tertium coarbitrum Sculptores absente modo Domino Danesio Cataneo et Sculptore coniudice et nobiscum non existente ut affirmamus in opinione iudices arbitri arbitratores communes amici et amicaibles compositores electi et assumpti pro et inter Clarissimum D. Petrum Venerio q. Clarissimi Domini Ioannis ex una [fol. 270v] et Ex.m Il. Doctorem D. Franciscum Sansovinum filium et heredem Domini Iacobi Sansovini ex altera d. et supra quadam difficultate pretensionis predicti Domini Francisci satisfactionis causa Sculpture et Protharie ob sepulturam bon: mem: Serenissimi P. D. Francisci Venerio in ecclesia Sancti Salvatoris et exadverso predicti Clarissimi Domini Petri intendentis satisfacisse dictum quondam Dominum Iacobum ex forma compromissi dici 27, martii proxime preteriti in actis notarum infrascriptum unde viso predicto compromisso et libertate nobis attribicte[?] visa petitione predicti Domini Francisci et respensione illices et replicis et aliis scripturis pro actum quam partem productis viso quodam libro product. pro dictum D. Franciscum et alio liberale etiam visis deniquam videndis et consideratis considerandis volentes ad expeditionem procedere et presentim etiam mandato Clarissimum Dominorum Conservatorem Legum

ob preceptum de eorum ordine nobis factum cui debemus omnino obedire. Sedentes ad cancellum net[?] infrascripti quem lecit elegimus pro idoneo ad hanc sententiam preserendam Christi nomine reperito a quo cuneta iud.a recta procedunt pro hanc sententiam [fol. 271r] quam de iure et de facto more veneto et inappellabiliter ferimus in his scriptis vulgariter sententiamus:

Che circa lopera de architettura de predetto Messer Francesco dicto nomine non possi dimandar cosa alcuna perche intendemo esser sta satisfatto il predetto quondam Messer Giacomo con li denari per essa receptuti de tutte le cose cioe dessegni, sagome, et modelli et ordinatione come se conviene a tal opera, quanto poi alle due figure principale de piera de Rovigno cioe una Charita et una Speranza poste nelli doi nichì maggiori della sepultura sopra le quale era difficulta terminamo che giurando el Clarissimo Messer Piero Venier haver mercado con esso quondam Messer Giacomo se stia ad esso giuramento in tutto et per tutto cum dicisione difficultatis. Ma pero terminiamo che si oltra quello fusse sta concluso in mercato il detto quondam Messer Giacomo havesse receptuto da esso Clarissimo Messer Piero alcuna cosa de piu per sua cortesia ovvero a rechiesta de esso quondam Messer Giacomo qual de piu non [fol. 271v] sia tenuto esso Messer Francesco restituir altrimente cosa alcuna ma il tutto resti in esso Messer Francesco perche l’opera veramente merita. Et sic salvis promissis imponemo perpetuo silentio et fine et mandemo ad esse parte che osservino questa sententia tacando al nodaro per la presente nostra sententia scuti doi da esser pagati per esso Clarissimo Messer Piero et cosi sententiemo. Laus Deo

Lecta et promulgata fecit supra arbitralis sententia pro suprascriptos d. iudices in loco suprascripto sub anno nativitatis Domini nostri.Jesu Xti mille quingentesimo septuagesimo primo inditione quartadecimo die vero lune 14 mensis maii presentibus Domino Ioanne Savina q. D. Francisci cive et not. veneto et Domino Ioanne de Sanctis q. D. Martini Testibus vocatis et rogatis.
ASVe: Notarile-Atti, busta 5614, fols. 270r-271v. First transcribed in Jones, “Business,” III, no. 4, doc. 4.9 (unpublished PhD thesis). Unpublished.

Doc. 3

1571, 14 May

Declaration by Francesco Sansovino that he accepts the arbiters’ decision.
[fol. 271v]
1571, die lune quartodecimo mensis maii ad cancellum
Ratificatio [in margin]
L’Exellente Messer Francesco Sansovino per nome come de sopra uditá la continentia et tenor della sopra sententia per me nodaro [fol. 272r] a si letta et publicata quela quanto a si lauda ratifica et approba voluntariamente promette osservar et haverla ferma et ratha et inappellabile sotto obligar de tutti sui beni de cadauna sorte presenti et futuri dec. et super quibus [ill.]

Testes Reverendus Dominus Leonardus Belinus ecclesia Sancte Marie Formose Plebanus et D. Marcus Antonius Capello q. D. Aloysii
ASVe, Notarile-Atti, busta 5614, fols. 271v-272r. First transcribed in Jones, “Business,” III, no. 4, doc. 4.10 [unpublished PhD thesis]. Unpublished.

Doc. 4

1571, 15 May

The final statement on the matter, agreed before the notary and witnesses on behalf of Piero Venier.

1571 die martis quintodecimo mensis maii ad cancellum
Ratificatio [in margin]
Constituido nanti a mi nodaro et testis infrascripti al sopradetto Clarissimo Messer Piero Venier odita la soprascritta sententia a si publicata quella voluntariamente ratifica et lauda et in essequitione de quella solenemente ha giurato ad sana dei evangelia chel mercato che sua Signoria Clarissima concluse col quondam Messer Giacomo fu in ducati ottanta per ciascuna delle figure due sopradette con questo che esso Messer Giacomo dovesse come se obligava poner sotto il suo nome acio fosse ben servito non dimeno esso Messer Iacomo hebbe da me ducati 20, in tutto altra il mercato sub quibus omnibus [fol. 272v] rogavit me no. hoc publicum conficere instrumentum.
Testes Reverendus Dominus Iulius Michael Clericus Venetus et Dominus Philippus Foresto Domini Gabrielis ASVe, Notarile-Atti, busta 5614, fol. 272r-v. First transcribed in Jones, “Business,” III, no. 4, doc. 4.11 (unpublished PhD thesis). Unpublished.



Fig. 16 / Detail of Sansovino's signature on *Hope*.

NOTES

1. Because family really *does* matter, this essay is dedicated with fondest love, admiration, and gratitude to our “amantissimo et cordialissimo” father, Charles Avery, on the joyful occasion of his eightieth birthday. Our grateful thanks to Professor Deborah Howard for kindly reading an earlier draft of this article, and to Matteo De Fina for his beautiful new photographs of the Venier Monument.
2. For the Venier Monument, see principally Bruce Boucher, *The Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino*, 2 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), I, pp. 118-123, 211-212, docs. 173-175, II, no. 32, pp. 339-340; Jan Simane, *Grabmonumente der Dogen: Venezianische Sepulkralkunst im Cinquecento* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1993), pp. 15-29; Victoria Avery, “The Early Works of Alessandro Vittoria” (PhD diss., 3 vols, University of Cambridge, 1996), I, pp. 141-144, II, no. 36, pp. 436-437, (accessible via: <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.58379>); Lorenzo Finocchi Ghersi, *Alessandro Vittoria: Architettura, scultura e decorazione nella Venezia del tardo Rinascimento* (Udine: Forum, 1998), pp. 92-95; and Manuela Morresi, *Jacopo Sansovino* (Milan: Electa, 2000), no. 60, pp. 333-335. For a full bibliography, see Emma Jones, “The Business of Sculpture in Renaissance Venice” (PhD diss., 3 vols, University of Cambridge, 2016), III, no. 4, p. 41 (accessible via: <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.58516>).
3. Francesco Venier’s date of birth may be calculated from the inscription on his funerary monument, which ends: “VIX[IT] AN[NOS] LXVII . DIES III OBIIT IIII NO[NIS] IVNII . M.D.LVI .” which translates as: “He lived 67 years 4 days. ... Died the fourth day before the Nones of June 1556”, that is 2 June 1556 in the Julian calendar. The following biographical information is derived from Andrea Da Mosto, *I dogi di Venezia* (Florence: Giunti, 2007), pp. 259-262.
4. Venier was one of only a small number of doges not to have been a Procurator of Saint Mark, although he tried five times to be elected to this prestigious office. See Da Mosto, *Dogi*, p. 260. Only four of the fifteen doges elected in the sixteenth century had not first been procurators (Marcantonio Trevisan, Francesco Venier, Lorenzo Priuli, Pietro Loredan). Although Francesco Sansovino, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare* (Venice: Domenico Farri, 1581), p. 273r, stated that Venier was sixty-four years old when he became doge, Da Mosto, *Dogi*, p. 260 correctly noted that he was sixty-five.
5. For further discussion of this portrait, see: <https://www.museothyssen.org/en/collection/artists/titian/portrait-doge-francesco-venier> (accessed August 2020).
6. His funerary inscription records “IN PRINCIPATV AN[NVM] I MEN[SEM] XI . DIES XXII” . (“In the office of Doge: 1 year, 11 months, 22 days”).
7. “Iautissime pompe dei conviti e dei banchetti delle ornate credenze, dei preziosi suoi vestiti e di altre tali magnificenze”; as cited by Da Mosto, *Dogi*, p. 260. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 273r recorded that the funeral

took place in Santi Giovanni e Paolo “dove fu lodato da Bernardino Loredano”.

8. Archivio di Stato di Venezia (hereafter ASVe): Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1207, no. 300. For a copy, see ASVe: Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1217, vol. 9, fols. 63v-64r. Published Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173.
9. “Voglio esser sepolto a San Francesco di la Vigna con pocca pompa et si come parera alli mei commissarii ... Lasso a San Francesco di la Vignia ducati quindese, oltra quello li aspettara per el mio funeral ...” Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173. This and all following translations are our own unless otherwise stated.
10. “Lasso mei commissarii Messer Piero Venier, mio amantissimo et cordialissimo fratello, il qual voglio sia per la mazor parte.” Venier further nominated four relatives: Chiara Venier, Cecilia Venier (widow of Federico Foscari), Zaccaria Vendramin, and Isabetta Venier. Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173.
11. “Lasso che siano celebrate al tempo de la mia morte dove parerà alli mei commissarii messe 300 ... Lasso alla Scuola de la Misericordia, oltra el suo consueto, ducati vinti da esser dispensati per messer lo guardian et deputati alla bancha a poveri fratelli come a loro conscientia parera. Lasso siano dispensati nella contra si troveremo habitare nel mese che Dio mi havea chiamato de questa vita ducati quindese a persone miserabili.” Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173.
12. As Simane noted, Venier had not sought a concession for any of the chapels in the nave of San Francesco della Vigna, as other Venetian patricians had done. Simane, *Grabmonumente*, p. 16. For a list of the principal concessions of burial spaces and chapels in San Francesco, see Deborah Howard, *Jacopo Sansovino: Architecture and Patronage in Renaissance Venice* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, first published 1975, ed. 1987), p. 159.
13. For San Francesco della Vigna’s reconstruction (1534-1558/61), see Howard, *Sansovino*, pp. 64-74; Antonio Foscari and Manfredo Tafuri, *L’armonia e i conflitti: la chiesa di San Francesco della Vigna nella Venezia del’500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983); and Morresi, *Sansovino*, no. 23, pp. 134-152.
14. ASVe: San Salvador, busta 41, fols. 74v-75v. Published Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 174. For a discussion of concession agreements generally and for San Salvador specifically, see Jones, “Business,” I, pp. 44-48.
15. “qui cupit habere locum in ecclesia predicti Monasteri Sancti Salvatoris, pro facienda sive fabricanda una honorifica sepultura ad sepellendum cadaver, sive ossa sua, et heredum suorum.” ASVe: San Salvador, busta 41, fol. 74v.
16. “ex opposite organi et januae per quam eggreditur in Merzzariam, ac inter altaria et pillastris capellarum Sanctae Mariae et Sancti Augustini.” ASVe: San Salvador, busta 41, fol. 75r.
17. “In quo loco predictus Serenissimus Princeps fieri et fabricari facere possit unam honoratam sepulturam cum suis ornamentis juxta eius voluntatem beneplacitur, et dispositarum ipsamque sepulturam

fabricari facere tam in pariete eiusdem ecclesium quam in terra sive pavimento.” ASVe: San Salvador, busta 41, fol. 75r.

18. “Cum hoc, qui predictus Reverendus Dominus Visitator dicto nomine per se, suosque successores teneatur de tempore in tempus nominare et appresentare heredibus antedicti Serenissimi Principis unum ex suis fratribus Sancti Salvatoris in mansionarium, elligendum postea et acceptandum per dictos heredes de anno in annum; qui quidem mansionarius sic nominatus et electus celebrare habeat singulo die in perpetuum unam missam pro anima ipsius Serenissimi Principis, faciendo de ea commemorationem....” ASVe: San Salvador, busta 41, fol. 75r.
19. “E contra vero supradictus Serenissimus Princeps promisit scribi facere predictis Reverendis Patribus Monasterii Sancti Salvatoris ducatos quadrigentos capitalis Montis Novissimi, sive subsidii ad ducatum pro ducato in electione ipsorum Reverendorum Patrum, quorum prodia sint eorundem Dominorum Patrum.” ASVe: San Salvador, busta 41, fol. 75r. Mansionaries could be paid for upfront with a lump sum, through a yearly payment, or via annual interest paid from an investment in one of the state loan funds, such as Venier’s. For further discussion, see Jones, “Business,” I, p. 45. For Venetian state loan funds, see Frederic Lane, *Venice: a Maritime Republic* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1973), p. 150; and Luciano Pezzolo, “The Venetian Economy,” in *A Companion to Venetian History, 1400-1797*, ed. Eric Dursteler (Leiden and Boston: Brill, first published 2013, ed. 2014), p. 270.
20. ASVe: Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1207, no. 300. For a copy, see ASVe: Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1217, vol. 9, fol. 64r-v. Published Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173.
21. Venier left a small monetary bequest to the friars: “revochemo l’ordine che per el testamento preditto davemo di esser sepolto a San Francesco di la Vigna. Item, quelle parole dove dicemo. Lasso a San Francesco di la Vigna ducati xv, oltra quello li spettera per el mio funeral, et in loco de ditti legati, li lassemo ducati vinti 20” Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173.
22. “volemo quanto alle exequie che si siegui quello che alli altri predecessori nostri è sta solito farsi per li heredi dei altri principi piu di quello che per el publico è costume di fare.” Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 211, doc. 173. Translation taken from Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 119.
23. “Volemo che per el fare de la ditta nostra archa et adornamento nella faza del muro et nel salizado sia speso al meno ducati mille, et cusi etiam non più de ducati mille et cinquecento.” ASVe: Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1207, no. 300.
24. “ad arbitrio de nostro fratello Messer Piero, overo de suoi fioli, et del fare questa opera quando per nui in vita nostra non fusse sta fatta, li aggravamo molto la conscientia che al meno in spatio di anni doi la sia fornida.” ASVe: Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1207, no. 300.

25. “Volemo ancora che’l nostro corpo sii posto nell’archa in terra che si fara, et non nel cassone nel muro, et questo per la humiltà che dovemo havere, et vergonessimento de la miseria nostra” ASVe: Notarile-Testamenti, busta 1207, no. 300. It is possible that the devout Venier was swayed by Catholic reform and the ruling that where burial within a church was allowed, the dead should be buried in the ground, not in wall-mounted tombs. For further discussion and the influence of Gian Matteo Giberti, Bishop of Verona (1495-1543) on the Venetian patriciate and tomb building, see Kathryn Hiesinger, “The Fregoso Monument: A Study in Sixteenth-Century Tomb Monuments and Catholic Reform,” *The Burlington Magazine* 118/878 (1976): pp. 282-293, and p. 287 for reference to Venier. See also Simane, *Grabmonumente*, pp. 26-27.
26. For the complex and extended building history of the Loredan Monument, see Victoria Avery, “Material Matters: Bronze and its (Non-)Employment in the Monuments to Venice’s Doges (1475-1625),” in *The Tombs of the Doges of Venice: From the Beginning of the Serenissima to 1907*, ed. Benjamin Paul (Rome: Viella, 2016), pp. 282-292.
27. Avery, “Material Matters,” pp. 284-285, and p. 285 n. 79.
28. Avery, “Material Matters,” p. 286 n. 82.
29. The *mier* was based on the heavy pound (or gross measure); one *mier* equalled ca. 477kg. For an overview of bronze prices in this period, see Jones, “Business,” I, pp. 115-117; and III, pp. 234-235 (*Table 3: Copper*), p. 236 (*Table 4: Tin*), and pp. 237-238 (*Table 5: Bronze*).
30. Boucher, *Sansocino*, I, p. 119.
31. By 1581, Sansovino noted in his guidebook that “in questo Tempio giacciono sedici Principe di Venetia.” Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 17r. For Venier’s funeral, see note 7.
32. For further discussion of Antonio Venier’s Monument, in relation to Francesco’s, see below.
33. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 47v. For the rebuilding of San Salvador, see principally Manfredo Tafuri, “*Pietas* repubblicana, neobizantinismo e umanesimo. Giorgio Spavento e Tullio Lombardo nella chiesa di San Salvador,” *Ricerche di Storia dell’Arte* 19 (1983): pp. 5-36; Ennio Concina, “Una fabbrica ‘in mezzo della città’: la chiesa e il convento di San Salvador,” in *Progetto S. Salvador. Un restauro per l’innovazione a Venezia*, ed. Fulvio Caputo (Venice: Albrizzi, 1988), pp. 73-153; and Ennio Concina, “San Salvador: la fabbrica, l’architettura,” in *La chiesa di San Salvador a Venezia. Storia, Arte, Teologia*, ed. Gianmario Guidarelli (Padua: Il Prato, 2009), pp. 9-27. For further discussion of San Salvador’s significance as a burial site, see Simane, *Grabmonumente*, pp. 27-28; and Daniela Bohde, “Titian’s Three-Altar Project in the Venetian Church of San Salvador: Strategies of Self-Representation by Members of the *Scuola Grande di San Rocco*,” *Renaissance Studies* 15/4 (2001): pp. 450-472, esp. pp. 454 and 465.
34. For Leonardo Loredan’s letter of 18 April 1515 that talks of San Salvador’s construction “in

- umbilico urbis”, and the letter to collect funds for its reconstruction “miraculosam[ente] constructa et fondata ... nel Mezo el centro di questa amplissima città sotto Titullo Del gloriosissimo salvator [nostro] M[esser] Y[ehsu] X[risto] ... essendo situata In Visceribus suis merita [de] piu amplo et mag[nifico] Hedeficio esser constructa”: see Bohde, “Titian’s Three-Altar Project,” p. 465 and n. 48, who explains that the term “viscera” meant not only entrails, but more precisely the uterus.
35. For thorough visual analysis and detailed discussion of the monument’s likely sources, including its indebtedness to Sansovino’s Loggetta in Venice, and to Peruzzi’s *Tomb of Pope Hadrian VI* in Rome, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 119-120; II, no. 32, pp. 339-340. See also Simane, *Grabmonumente*, pp. 18-25; and Morresi, *Sansovino*, no. 60, pp. 333-335. For the Mocenigo Monument, see Anne Markham Schultz’s entry in *La Basilica dei Santi Giovanni e Paolo*, ed. Giuseppe Pavanello (Venice: Marcianum Press, 2012), pp. 185-189. For an overview of earlier dogal tombs and monuments, see Paul, *Tombs*, with its useful bibliography.
 36. For the *Monument to Doge Antonio Venier*, see Silvia d’Ambrosio’s entry in Pavanello, *Santi Giovanni e Paolo*, pp. 110-114.
 37. Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 119.
 38. The late fifteenth-century group in glazed terracotta at the Ospedaletto is a notable example that may have lain at the back of the mind of both patron and sculptor.
 39. As found, for example, on the dogal monuments to Pietro Mocenigo (15 figures), Andrea Vendramin (19 figures), and Nicolò Tron (22 figures; see fig. 6), the first two located in Santi Giovanni e Paolo, the third in Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari.
 40. Both are over 2 m tall: *Charity* is 239.4 cm; *Hope* is 241 cm. For a full discussion of their stylistic traits and sources, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 121-122.
 41. Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 122, and 267-268 n. 86. See also Simane, *Grabmonumente*, pp. 23-24, for a discussion of the *Virtues* as personifications of the active and contemplative life. For the importance of charity to Venetian Statecraft, see Brian Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice: The Social Institutions of a Catholic State, to 1620* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), esp. pp. 7-8, and 214-216.
 42. For further discussion of the iconographic readings of this figure, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 122 and 268 nn. 90-91.
 43. The epitaph reads: “FRANCISCVS VENERIVS PRINCEPS[.] PRISCAE MAIORVM / VIRTVTIS. AC DISCIPLINAE VERE IMITATOR[.] NVLLO NEC / ADVMBRATAE LAVDIS STIMVLO . NEC PRIVATAE VTILITATIS / ERRORE VNQVAM PERMOTVS . IN REGEN[DIS] POPVLIS SVMMAE / CONTINENTIAE . IN DICVNDA SENTENTIA SENATORIAE / GRAVITATIS . PACIS . ET CONCORDIAE AMANTISS[IMVS]. IN OMNI / SERMONE SAPIENTISS[IMVS].

- SEMPER IN PRINCIPATV[.] NIHIL PRAETER / ORNAMENTVM PRINCIPIS . QVOD EST IVSTVM IMPERIVM . / PVLCHERRIMVM LIBERIS CIVIBVS EXEMPLVM . / VIX[IT] AN[NOS] LXVII . DIES IIII . IN PRINCIPATV AN[NVM] I MEN[SEM] XI . DIES XXII. / OBIIT IIII NO[NIS] IVNII . M.D.LVI.” This may be translated as: “Francesco Venier, prince, truly a follower of the ancient virtue and discipline of [our] forebears, never the [spur?] to false glory, nor was [he] ever influenced by the sin of private gain. In ruling the people [he observed] the utmost restraint, in pronouncing judgement in the senate [he was full of] gravity and peace, and the most loving harmony in all his most wise speech. Throughout his reign [he] never did anything that was not to the credit/honour of the prince, that is just rule [and] the most beautiful example to free citizens. He lived 67 years 4 days. In the office of Doge: 1 year, 11 months, 22 days. Died the fourth day before the Nones of June 1556 [i.e. 2 June 1556].” With grateful thanks to Suzanne Reynolds and Deborah Howard for the translation of this inscription. According to Giuseppe Tassinì, *Iscrizioni della chiesa e convento di S. Salvatore* (Venice, 1895), no. 9, pp. 13-14, the inscription was composed by Giovanni Donà. Taken from Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 267 n. 76.- 44. This point was also made by Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 120.
- 45. Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 121.
- 46. For discussion of the architectural aspects of the Venier Monument, and its sources of inspiration, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 120; and II, pp. 339-340; Simane, *Grabmonumente*, pp. 15-16, 19-20; and Morresi, *Sansovino*, no. 60, pp. 333-335. The total cost of the monument is not known, but the high-value materials would have added considerably to its cost.
- 47. The extent of the gilding was revealed when the tomb was cleaned by the Soprintendenza ai Beni Architettonici di Venezia in 1986-1987 (under the direction of Ettore Merkel). See Melissa Conn and David Rosand, ed., *Save Venice Inc. Four Decades of Restoration in Venice* (New York and Venice: Grafiche Veneziane / Save Venice Inc., 2011), pp. 388-389.
- 48. See Boucher, *Sansovino*, II, p. 339.
- 49. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 273r: “fu posto nella Chiesa di S. Salvatore, in richchissimo, & Regal sepolcro di marmor, posto alla memoria sua da Pietro suo fratello.”
- 50. Victoria Avery, “Documenti sulla vita e le opere di Alessandro Vittoria (c. 1525-1608),” *Studi Trentini di Scienze Storiche*, Sezione Prima, 78/1 (1999): Supplemento, p. 206, doc. 34(î)-(iv).
- 51. “ali .30. hotobrio .1557. L. 6. S. 10. A Antonio di Maestro Picio per aver lavorato cinque giornate sula Pieta di Clarissimo Venier fratello dil Principe. Val – L. 6. S. 10.”; Avery, “Documenti,” p. 205, doc. 34(î).
- 52. “ali .6. novembrio .1557. Ricevi dal Magnifico Signor Giovanni Venerio a bon conto dela Pieta va Posta ala sepoltura dil Prencepi a santo Salvatore Ducati numero – 10 –”. Avery, “Documenti,” p. 206, doc. 34(ii).

53. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, docs. 34(ii) and 34(iv).
54. Simane, *Grabmonumente*, p. 17, citing a document in Eugenia Carol Burns, *San Salvatore and Venetian Church Architecture, 1490-1530* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1987), p. 69.
55. "E in Venezia dà splendore alla piazza la facciata di San Gimignano, e nella merceria la facciata di San Giuliano, e in San Salvador la ricchissima sepoltura del Principe Francesco Veniero". Giorgio Vasari, *Vita de M. Jacopo Sansovino, scultore e architetto della Repubblica di Venezia* (First published 1570; ed. Venice: Antonio Zatta e figli, 1789), p. 27.
56. For Sansovino's biography in the *Vite* of 1568, see Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architettori*, 3 vols. (Florence: Appresso i Giunti, 1568), III, pp. 822-831. For further discussion of the 1570 biography, published as a stand-alone volume, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 161-162, 276 n. 23.
57. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 48r: "Et poco discosto, è collocate in sepoltura di marmo, con 2. figure di singolare bellezza, di mano del Sansovino, così l'architettura del sepolcro come anco le predette figure, Francesco Veniero Doge 80. che fu l'anno 1554 ...".
58. Vasari, *Vite*, III, p. 833: "... & apresso fece [Vittoria] una Pietà, con due figure di pietra tenute buone, che sono a san Salvatore in Vinetia." It is unclear why he did not also attribute the dogal effigy to Vittoria.
59. For further discussion of Sansovino's signature, see below. Although Boucher states that "the statues of *Hope* and *Charity* are signed in the conventional manner employed by Sansovino elsewhere" (Boucher, *Sansovino*, II, p. 339), it was unusual for Sansovino to include even one of his professions, let alone both of them. The only other time Sansovino employed a similar signature was on his relief of *The Miracle of the Maiden Carilla* for the Cappella di Sant'Antonio, in the Santo, Padua, which he signed, "IACOBVS SANSOVINVS SCVLP. ET ARCHITEC. FLORENT. F". For this relief, see principally Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 94-99; II, no. 30, pp. 337-338; Sarah Blake McHam, *The Chapel of St Anthony at the Santo and the Development of Venetian Renaissance Sculpture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 56-58; and pp. 220-224, docs. 60-70; and below.
60. For further discussion of the reasons for Sansovino's choice, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 118 and 135.
61. For Cappello's support of Sansovino, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 42.
62. See Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 120: it was Salvador and his business partners who executed the architectural elements of Archbishop Livio Podocataro's tomb (after a design by Sansovino) in San Sebastiano (1557-1565). For this commission, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 123-125, 218-220, docs. 196-199; II, no. 33, pp. 340-341; Morresi, *Sansovino*, pp. 340-343; and more recently, Sarah Blake McHam, "Cyprus meets Venice and Rome: The Tomb of Livio Podocataro," *Source: Notes in Art History* 36, 3/4 (2017): pp. 190-200.
63. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, doc. 34(ii).
64. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, doc. 34(ii).
65. Avery, "Documenti," p. 205, doc. 34(i). As was common, Vittoria generally used one of two main systems of "money of account" in his book-keeping. The currency recorded in these payments was based on the *lira di piccoli*. The breakdown was: 1 ducat (of account) = 6 *lire* 4 *soldi*; 1 *lira* = 20 *soldi*, or 240 *denarii*. 1 ducat of account = 124 *soldi*. There was an actual gold coin called a ducat (or *zecchino*) which was worth 10 *lire* at this time. The ducats mentioned in the documents cited here are ducats of account. For the other system, based on the gold ducat, see Jones, "Business," III, p. 1.
66. "ali 22 Zenaro .1558. / Lire 4 soldi 16 A Tomaso da Zara per aver polito la Madona dela soprascritta Pieta per saldo e resto del nostro mercato": Avery, "Documenti," p. 205, doc. 34(i).
67. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, docs 34(iii) and 34(iv).
68. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, docs 34(iii) and 34(iv).
69. Patrons commonly directly employed the various (and often many) artisans and artists needed to construct a complex commission such as this, rather than the designer, architect or a *proto* doing so. For further discussion of how sculptors and stonemasons were contracted in quattrocento Venice, see Susan Connell, *The Employment of Sculptors and Stonemasons in Venice in the Fifteenth Century* (New York and London: Garland, 1988); for sculptors in the Cinquecento, see Jones, "Business". A *proto* (or *protomaestro*) was essentially a project manager or foreman but could denote a more senior position – a superintendent of buildings – such as Jacopo Sansovino's role as *proto* for the Procuratori di San Marco de Supra (responsible for the fabric of San Marco and the Piazza). For further discussion of *proti*, see Deborah Howard, *Venice Disputed: Marc'Antonio Barbaro and Venetian Architecture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 134-136; and Martin Gaier, *Architettura "venetiana."* *I proti veneziani e la politica edilizia del Cinquecento* (Sommacampagna [Verona]: Cierre, 2019).
70. In his account-book, under 25 July 1557, Vittoria proudly recorded how he had become a *padrone* in the guild. Avery, "Documenti," p. 204, doc. 31.
71. For Vittoria's workshop and division of labour, see Victoria Avery, "La bottega di Alessandro Vittoria," in *"La bellissima maniera": Alessandro Vittoria e la cultura veneta del Cinquecento*, eds. Andrea Bacchi, Lia Camerlengho, and Manfred Leithe-Jasper, exh. cat. (Trent: Provincia Autonoma di Trento, 2008), pp. 126-139.
72. "per aver lavorato 2 giornate sul Dose di la dita Pieta." Avery, "Documenti," p. 205, doc. 34(i), under 30 October and 9 December respectively.
73. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, doc. 34(iii).
74. Avery, "Documenti," p. 197, doc. 24(iii). For the Contarini Monument, see Charles Davis, "Il monumento di Alessandro Contarini al Santo di Padova," in *Michele Sanmicheli: Architettura, linguaggio e cultura artistica nel Cinquecento*, eds. Howard Burns, Christoph Frommel, and Leonello Puppi (Vicenza: CISA, 1995), pp. 180-195, 306-313; Avery, "Early

- Works," I, pp. 136-141; II, no. 33, pp. 430-432; and Finocchi Ghersi, *Vittoria*, pp. 81-92.
75. "ali .18. Marzo 1558 / Lire 6 soldi 10 a Maestro Antonio de Picio per aver lavorato .5. giorni sula Fama deli soprascritti Contarini": Avery, "Documenti," p. 198, doc. 24(iv), under 18 March 1558. The work was most likely blocking out, given that this payment dates to the start of the project.
76. Avery, "Documenti," p. 197, doc. 24(iii): Vittoria received instalments from Pietro and Pandolfo Contarini on 21 March (10 ducats); 24 July (13 ducats); 25 September (8 ducats); 20 November (10 ducats); and the final settlement of the agreed 60-ducats fee on 22 December (19 ducats).
77. Avery, "Documenti," p. 206, doc. 34(iv).
78. See Appendix, doc. 1.
79. For further discussion, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 140.
80. For the Sacristy Door litigation, which involved several changes in arbiters, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 71-72, 235-240, docs. 262-294; and Victoria Avery, *Vulcan's Forge in Venus' City: The Story of Bronze in Venice, 1350-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 101-103, 109-110. Francesco also made claims for compensation for other works by Jacopo, including the *Madonna and Child*, now in the Chiesetta of the Doge's Palace, and the figures of *Mars* and *Neptune* on the *Scala dei Giganti* of the same building. For the documents, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 240-243, docs. 295-303, and pp. 224-227, docs. 226-239 respectively.
81. In notarial acts, these are usually called "protestatio" and "refutatio." It remains unknown as to whether Francesco Sansovino and Piero Venier involved a notary before going to arbitration.
82. The "compromissum" recorded the appointment of arbiters, normally whom they were representing, and outlined the case under investigation. On occasion, it might also include the arbiters' final decision. For further discussion of litigation and legal redress in the business of sculpture in sixteenth-century Venice, see Jones, "Business," I, pp. 151-158; and Emma Jones, "Love, Lies and Litigation: The saga of Alessandro Vittoria's *Saint John the Baptist*," *Colognghi Studies* 2 (2018): pp. 58-59. See also Connell, *Employment*, pp. 208-221, whose research on arbitration and its employment in the sphere of fifteenth-century sculptors and stonemasons is invaluable.
83. "che per perito per la parte di essi clarissimi procuratori nella causa con Domino Francesco Sansuin, doctor, nomina messer Francesco Segala, sculptor, et medesimamente il predetto Domino Francesco Sansuin nomina messer Danese Cathaneo, sculptor, per la parte sua": Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 237, doc. 273.
84. Cattaneo was not only named as an executor in Sansovino's final will of 10 September 1568 ("el maestro caro Danese Cattaneo schultor [sic]"), but he was also gifted various models and casts. See Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 233-234, doc. 256, at p. 234. For Sansovino's workshop and assistants, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 142-158.
85. Appendix, doc. 1, from "Quia virtutur" to "semel et pluries".
86. Appendix, doc. 1, fol. 168v: from "in casu discordiae eligendi tertium ..."
87. "1571 die mercurii 4 mensis aprilis ad cancellum. Contrascriptus Magnificus Dominus Io. Venerio paterno nomine in tertium coniudicem elegit D. Thomá dal Contino Sculptorem." Appendix, doc. 1, fol. 168r. It is unclear as to which Tommaso "dal Contino" this was. The well-documented architect-cum-*proto* Bernardino Contin (1530-1596) had three sons, Antonio, Francesco, and Tommaso, but as the latter was only born in 1570, it cannot have been him. Giovanni had been nominated to act on his father's behalf in the original "compromissum".
88. "1571 die lunae 30 aprilis ad cancellum. Contrascriptae partes proprogant compromisum pro dies quindecim proxime futuros." Appendix, doc. 1, fol. 168v.
89. Appendix, doc. 2.
90. Appendix, doc. 2, fol. 271r-v.
91. "tutte le cose cioe disegni, sagome, et modelli et ordinatione come se conviene a tal opera ...". Appendix, doc. 2, fol. 271r.
92. Appendix, doc. 2, fol. 271r, from "quanto poi alle due figure" to "sopra le quale era difficulta".
93. Appendix, doc. 2, fol. 271r, from "terminiamo che" to "Messer Giacomo".
94. Appendix, doc. 2, fol. 271v, from "qual de piu" to "veritamente merita".
95. Appendix, doc. 2, fol. 271v, from "Et sic salvis promissis" to "et cosi sententiamo".
96. Appendix, doc. 3.
97. Appendix, doc. 4.
98. Appendix, doc. 4, from "solenemente ha giurato" to "in tutto altra il mercato".
99. For further discussion, see Jones, "Business," I, pp. 76-78.
100. Final settlement of complex commissions could be lengthy and complicated. See, for example, Sansovino's aforementioned relief of *The Miracle of the Maiden Carilla*: contracted in 1536, settled in March 1562, finally installed in 1563. See note 59 above; and Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 208-210, docs. 159-167, for the documents.
101. See Jones, "Business," I, pp. 78-79; III, pp. 224-233, *Table 2: Sculptors' Fees*.
102. Who supplied the materials for the complex, and from where remains unknown, but Sansovino and/or the stonemasons involved may well have assisted the patron fully or in part. For a broader discussion, see most recently Emma Jones, "The Sculptural Stones of Venice: The Selection, Supply, and Cost of Marble and Stone in the Sixteenth Century," in *Making and Moving Sculpture in Early Modern Italy*, ed. Kelley Helmstuder Di Dio (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 111-136; and Jones, "Business," I, pp. 85-101, with extensive bibliography.
103. "Messer Iacopo Sansoin, fiorentino, schultore exelentissimo, sta in Venetia ... obligato a meter el suo

- nome scholpito soto dito quadro ..." McHam, *Chapel*, p. 221, doc. 63. The *massari* were "members of the board of overseers" at the Santo (McHam, *Chapel*, p. 2), i.e. the close equivalent of ecclesiastical lay procurators.
104. The only reliefs in the chapel that had previously been signed were those by Tullio and Antonio Lombardo but the inclusion of their signatures had not been a contractual obligation. McHam, *Chapel*, p. 56.
105. For an overview of sculptors' workshops in Venice from the fifteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries, see Wolfgang Wolters, "Sculpture", in Norbert Huse and Wolfgang Wolters, *The Art of Renaissance Venice: Architecture, Sculpture and Painting 1460-1590*, trans. Edward Jephcott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 129-134 (letter also discussed pp. 133-134); for the period 1525-1625, see Jones, "Business," I, pp. 128-140.
106. "io dovessi far una statua d'Hercole ... , mi accordai seco, con animo di farla fare a qualche mio giovane, giudandolo, e correggendolo'io senza provi le mani, com'io soglio far qua di molte altre sculture, non havendo tempo per esser impedito ne le fabriche de le quali ho carico, di scolpir di mia mano." Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, p. 220, doc. 204. For the commission of this colossal statue for Ercole II d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 130-134 (letter discussed p. 131); and II, no. 34, p. 341.
107. For a sensitive analysis of the differences between these figures, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, I, pp. 121-122. For a summary of the qualitative assessment of these figures by previous scholars, see Boucher, *Sansovino*, II, no. 32, pp. 32-33.
108. Wolters, "Sculpture," p. 133. As he points out, few sculptures produced in Venice prior to Sansovino's arrival were signed (pertinent exceptions being Donatello's *Baptist* [Frari], Antonio Rizzo's *Eve* [Arco Foscari], Tullio Lombardo's *Coronation of the Virgin* [Cappella Bernabò, San Giovanni Crisostomo], and a handful of works by Pyrgoteles and Simone Bianco), plus the earlier reliefs in the Cappella dell'Arca, in the Santo. This is quite distinct from the practice of painters in Venice, who commonly, and often prominently, signed their work long before Sansovino's arrival. For signatures on Venetian bronzes, see Avery, *Vulcan's Forge*, pp. 90-92; and Claudia Kryza-Gersch, "Confusing Signatures on Bronzes: Sculptor and Caster in Renaissance Venice," *Artibus et Historiae* 76 (2017): pp. 95-112. For sculptors' signatures and identity in Renaissance Italy, see David Boffa, "Sculptors' Signatures and the Construction of Identity," in *A Scarlet Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Sarah Blake McHam*, ed. Arnold Victor Coonin (New York: Italica, 2013), pp. 35-56; and for a case-study on why, when and how Vittoria signed his works, see Victoria Avery, "Alessandro Vittoria's Socles: Shaping and Naming," in *Display and Displacement: Sculpture and the Pedestal from Renaissance to Post-Modern*, ed. Alexandra Gerstein (London: Courtauld Institute of Art Research Forum and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007), pp. 16-32.
109. This was influenced in part by the related debate (later called the "paragone") about which was superior: painting or sculpture. For the changing status of the artist in Renaissance Italy, see Emma Barker, Nick Webb, and Kim Woods, eds., *The Changing Status of the Artist* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999) and Francis Ames-Lewis, *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).
110. For these concepts in the broader context of Renaissance Italy, see Martin Kemp, *Behind the Picture: Art and Evidence in the Italian Renaissance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 226-255. Sansovino's double signature and self-portrait on his Sacristy Door in San Marco, for example, was surely his way of acknowledging the primacy of his role in the commission, despite the large team of assistants and other specialists behind its execution. As with the Venier Monument, the door would not have existed without Sansovino's design, nor his management of its production.
111. See note 57 above. Sansovino's unusual signature set a precedent for other sculptors in San Salvador, who proceeded to record their authorship in particularly novel or elaborate ways. Vittoria, for example, cunningly placed his signature on the pendant *Saint Sebastian* and *Saint Roch* (late 1580s) on the Pork-butchers' altar across the two most visible sides of both sculptures' socles, so that his name was fully legible from all viewing points. Similarly, Giulio del Moro boldly signed his statue of the *Risen Christ* (ca. 1595-1604) on the monument to Andrea Dolfin and his wife 'IVLVIS MAVRVS VERONENSIS / SCVLPTOR PICTOR ET / ARCHITECTVS F', proclaiming for all to see that he was not only its Veronese author, but also a sculptor, architect, and painter, thus trumping even Sansovino's professional credentials.